AD635900

Carnegie Institute of Technology

Pittsburgh 13, Pennsylvania

GRADUATE SCHOOL of INDUSTRIAL ADMINISTRATION

William Larimer Mellon, Founder

Management Sciences Research Report No. 74

SEMI-INFINITE PROGRAMMING, DIFFERENTIABILITY AND GEOMETRIC PROGRAMMING: PART II

by

A. Charnes*, W. W. Cooper, and K. O. Kortanek**

April, 1966

MANAGEMENT SCIENCES RESEARCH GROUP
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF INDUSTRIAL ADMINISTRATION
CARNEGIE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA 15213

* Northwestern University

** Cornell University, Department of Industrial Engineering and Operations Research. The research of K. O. Kortanek was supported by the Pilot Program in Environmental Systems Analysis, NIH, 1 P10 ES 00098-01, Walter R. Lynn, Director.

This report was prepared as part of the activities of the Management Sciences Research Group, Carnegie Institute of Technology, (under Contract NONR 760(24), NR 047-048 with the U. S. Office of Naval Research) and as part of the activities of the Systems Research Group, Northwestern University (under Contract NONR 1228(10), NR 047-021 with the U. S. Office of Naval Research).

We propose to specialize the CCK duality theory,[1] which associates as dual problems minimization of an arbitrary convex function over an arbitrary convex set in n-space with maximization of a linear function in non-negative variables of a generalized finite sequence space subject to a finite system of linear equations, to derive Kuhn-Tucker Theorem[2] extensions in situations involving (partial) differentiability of objective and constraint functions. There are several ways to procure such generalizations as, for example, by means of non-differentiable analogs of quasi-saddle point conditions or in terms of a saddle point criterion itself. Since we are interested here in exploring extensions which involve some differentiability conditions, we shall proceed via the former course especially since these conditions themselves are analogs of first order conditions of the saddle point criterion.[3]

For our purposes then, let $f(u)$, and $G(u) = (g_1(u), g_2(u),\dots,g_m(u))$ be defined over an open convex set K in R_n. We shall say that $f(u)$ is simple piecewise differentiably convex if $f(u) = \max_{j=1,2,\dots,N} \{f^{(j)}(u)\}$, where $f^{(j)}(u)$ is continuously differentiable and convex over K. We shall assume that $G(u)$ is continuously differentiable and concave, but the extension to simple piecewise concave functions will become apparent during the course of proof for functions of this class.

---

1 See Charnes-Cooper-Kortanek [4] and [5].

2 See Kuhn-Tucker [7] and Arrow-Hurwicz-Uzawa [1].

3 See Arrow-Hurwicz-Usawa, ibid., where the authors show that in the case of differentiability the quasi-saddle point condition implies the saddle point condition.

<u>Theorem</u> (Generalized Quasi-Saddle Point Theorem for Simple Piecewise Differentiably Convex Functions)

Let $f(u)$ and $G(u)$ have the properties defined above and consider the minimization problem

$$\min f(u)$$
$$\text{subject to } G(u) \geq 0.$$

Assume the constraint set $C = \{u \mid G(u) \geq 0\}$ has an interior point.[1] Then u^* in C is an optimal solution to the minimization problem if and only if there exists positive vectors

$$\eta^* = (\eta_*^{(1)}, \eta_*^{(2)}, \ldots, \eta_*^{(N)}) \text{ and } \lambda^* = (\lambda_*^{(1)}, \ldots, \lambda_*^{(m)}) \text{ such that}$$

the following properties hold:

$$(1) \quad -\sum_{j=1}^{N} (\partial f^{(j)} |_{u^*}) \eta_*^{(j)} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} (\partial g^{(i)} |_{u^*}) \lambda_*^{(i)} = 0$$

$$(2) \quad \sum_{j \in J} \eta_*^{(j)} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad (3) \quad G(u^*)^T \lambda^* = 0, \text{ and } G(u^*) \geq 0^2, \text{ where}$$
$$J = \{j / f^{(j)}(u^*) = f(u^*)\}$$

<u>Preliminary Lemmas on Canonical Closure for Differential Systems</u>

By introducing support systems for both objective and constraint functions, we obtain the following equivalent semi-infinite problem (I) with semi-infinite dual (II), which, for the moment, we write in general form.

(I)	(II)
$\min z$	$\max \sum_{\alpha} d_\alpha \eta_\alpha + \sum_i c_i \lambda_i$
$z - u^T Q_\alpha \geq d_\alpha, \; \alpha \in A$	$\sum_{\alpha} \eta_\alpha = 1$
$u^T P_i \geq c_i, \; i \in I$	$-\sum_{\alpha} Q_\alpha \eta_\alpha + \sum_i P_i \lambda_i = 0$
	$\eta_\alpha, \lambda_i \geq 0.$

---

[1] This type of constraint qualification has strong intuitive appeal especially in the case of non-differentiability.
However, it is known that non-differentiable analogs to the most general constraint qualification for which differentiable Lagrangian techniques are valid (see [6]) involve support systems which are themselves Farkas-Minkowski systems. (See [4] and [5]).

[2] Notationally speaking, $\partial f|_{u^*}$ is the gradient of f evaluated at u^*. We use superscripts to correspond to functions and subscripts to correspond to elements in the index set. Thus, $\partial f_\alpha^{(j)}$ denotes the gradient of $f^{(j)}$ evaluated at the point $\alpha \in A$. For convenience, "$\alpha \in A$" may be identified with "$u_\alpha \in A$", when $A \subseteq R_n$.

Recall that a system of linear inequalities is canonically closed if it has interior points and the coefficient set is compact.[1] We need the following lemma.

Lemma 1: Suppose that the system is canonically closed and that u_* solves (I), i.e., the minimum $z_* = f(u_*)$ is attained. Then in the dual expression, (II), for z_*, the only supports which arise are those passing through the point (z_*, u_*), i.e., the only support planes with $\eta^*_a \neq 0$ and $\lambda^*_i \neq 0$ are those for which $z_* = u_*^T Q_\alpha + d_\alpha$ and $u_*^T P_i = c_i$.

Proof: By the extended dual theorem, there exist η, λ such that

$$z_* = \sum_\alpha d_\alpha \eta_\alpha^* + \sum c_i \lambda_i^*.$$

We must show that if $\eta^*_\alpha > 0$, then $z_* = u_*^T Q_\alpha + d_\alpha$ and if $\lambda^*_i > 0$, then $u_*^T P_i = c_i$.

First, $z_* - u_*^T Q_\alpha \geq d_\alpha$, for all a. Hence

$$\sum_\alpha d_\alpha \eta^*_\alpha \leq \sum_\alpha z_* \eta^*_\alpha - \sum_\alpha (u_*^T Q_\alpha)\, \eta^*_\alpha = z_* - \sum_\alpha (u_*^T Q_\alpha)\, \eta^*_\alpha.$$

Therefore,

$$z_* = \sum_\alpha d_\alpha \eta^*_\alpha + \sum_i c_i \lambda^*_i \leq z_* - \sum_\alpha (u_*^T Q_\alpha)\, \eta^*_\alpha + \sum_i c_i \lambda^*_i \text{ , \underline{i}.\underline{e}.,}$$

$$\text{(A)} \quad - \sum_\alpha (u_*^T Q_\alpha)\, \eta^*_\alpha + \sum_i c_i \lambda^*_i \geq 0$$

---

[1] See [4] and [5]. Note that canonical closure is a sufficient condition but not necessary for the validity of the extended dual theorem as pointed out in [4].

On the other hand, by dual feasibility,

$$u_*^T \; [-\sum_\alpha Q_\alpha \eta_\alpha^* + \sum_i P_i \lambda_i^*] \; = u_*^T \; (0) = 0.$$

However, since $u_*^T P_i \geq c_i$ for all i, we can rewrite this as follows:

(B) $$0 = \sum_\alpha -u_*^T Q_\alpha \eta_\alpha^* + \sum_i u_*^T P_i c_i \geq -\sum_\alpha u_*^T Q_\alpha \eta_\alpha^* + \sum_i c_i \lambda_i^*.$$

Therefore combining (A) and (B) we have,

$$\sum_\alpha u_*^T Q_\alpha \eta_\alpha^* = \sum_i c_i \lambda_i^*.$$

Two conclusions follow:

(C_1) $z_* = \sum_\alpha [u_*^T Q_\alpha + d_\alpha] \; \eta_\alpha^*$, where $\sum_\alpha \eta_\alpha^* = 1$, $\eta \geq 0$, and

$z_* \geq u_*^T Q_\alpha + d_\alpha$. Hence $z_* = u_*^T Q_\alpha + d_\alpha$ for every α with $\eta_\alpha^* > 0$.

(C_2) $\sum_i u_*^T P_i \lambda_i^* = \sum_i c_i \lambda_i^* \Rightarrow \sum_i (u_*^T P_i - c_i) \lambda_i^* = 0$

Hence $\lambda_i^* > 0$ implies $u_*^T P_i = c_i$.

<u>Proof of Theorem</u>

With respect to the minimization problem of the Theorem, consider the particular semi-infinite equivalent

$$\min z \qquad \qquad \text{(I)}$$

subject to $z - u^T \partial f_\alpha^{(j)} \geq f^{(j)}(u_\alpha) - u_\alpha^T \, \partial f_\alpha^{(j)}$, $j = 1,2,\ldots,N$

$$u^T \partial g_\alpha^{(i)} \geq -g^{(i)}(u_\alpha) + u_\alpha^T \partial g^{(i)}(u_\alpha), \; i = 1,2,\ldots,m$$

for all $\alpha \in A$, where A is some index set in R_n (e.g. the convex constraint set C). Since C has interior points, it follows that this linear inequality system also does. Form a canonical normalization[1], (i.e., divide each inequality by a positive constant to make the sum of the absolute values of the coefficients sum to 1), to obtain an equivalent system with bounded coefficients and interiority.

$$(\hat{I})$$

$$\min z$$

subject to $\mu_\alpha^{(j)} z - u^T \partial f_\alpha^{(j)} \mu_\alpha^{(j)} \geq f^{(j)}(u_\alpha)\mu_\alpha^{(j)} - u_\alpha^T \partial f_\alpha^{(j)} \mu_\alpha^{(j)}, \ \mu_\alpha^{(j)} > 0$

$$u^T \partial g_\alpha^{(i)} \, v_\alpha^{(i)} \geq - g^{(i)}(u_\alpha) v_\alpha^{(i)} + u_\alpha^T \partial g^{(i)}(u_\alpha) v_\alpha^{(i)}, \ v_\alpha^{(i)} > 0$$

where $j = 1,2,\ldots,m$, and $\alpha \in A$.

Now form a canonical closure by possibly enlarging the index set to $\bar{A} \supseteq A$ and adjoining the corresponding limiting inequalities which are of the form; $\mu_\alpha^{(j)} z - u^T Q_\alpha^{(j)} \geq d_\alpha^{(j)}$

$$u^T P_\alpha^{(i)} \geq c_\alpha^i \qquad \text{for } \alpha \in \bar{A} - A.$$

Let $(\bar{I})$ denote this new canonically closed equivalent (which differs from $(\hat{I})$ by only these possibly adjoined inequalities and also has interior points).

Now if u^* is optimal for (I) it is also optimal for the canonically closed equivalent $(\bar{I})$ and lemma 1 applies. However, any of the possibly newly adjoined inequalities which are actively involved in the dual are positive multiples of differential hyperplanes already in the system, for suppose one of them has a $\lambda^{(j)} > 0$, say, $\mu_\alpha^{(j)} z - u^T Q_\alpha^{(j)} \geq d_\alpha^{(j)}$ with $\alpha \in \bar{A} - A$. Then by lemma 1, the support plane $\mu_\alpha^{(j)} z - u^T Q_\alpha^{(j)} = d_\alpha^{(j)}$ contains the point $(u^*, f(u^*))$ i.e.,

---

[1] See [5], p 114

$\mu_\alpha^{(j)}f(u^*) = \mu_\alpha^{(j)}z_* = u^{*T}Q_\alpha^{(j)} + d_\alpha^{(j)}$, or equivalently, the plane $\mu_\alpha^{(j)}z = u^TQ_\alpha^{(j)} + d_\alpha^{(j)}$ is tangent to the surface $z = f^{(j)}(u)$ at the point u^*. Since $f^{(j)}(u)$ is continuously differentiable, and since $\mu_\alpha^{(j)}z \geq u^TQ_\alpha^{(j)} + d_\alpha^{(j)}$ over C, this tangent plane is uinque up to a constant positive multiple, and therefore we do not need to adjoin these additional inequalities. A similar argument obviously holds for the constraint functions.

We now present the semi-infinite dual $(\overline{II})$ and derive the conditions of the theorem.

$$\max \sum_j \sum_\alpha [f^{(j)}(u_\alpha)\mu_\alpha^{(j)} - u_\alpha^T \partial f_\alpha^{(j)}\mu_\alpha^{(j)}]\bar{\eta}_\alpha^{(j)} + \sum_j \sum_\alpha [-g^{(i)}(u_\alpha)v_\alpha^{(i)} + u_\alpha^T \partial g^{(i)}(u_\alpha)v_\alpha^{(i)}]\bar{\lambda}_\alpha^{(i)}$$

subject to

$$\sum_j \mu_\alpha^{(j)}\bar{\eta}_\alpha^{(j)} = 1$$

$$-\sum_j \sum_\alpha (\partial f_\alpha^{(j)}\mu_\alpha^{(j)})\bar{\eta}_\alpha^{(j)} + \sum_i \sum_\alpha \partial g_\alpha^{(i)}v_\alpha^{(i)}\bar{\lambda}_\alpha^{(i)} = 0$$

and $\bar{\eta}, \bar{\lambda} \geq 0.$

By the dual theorem there exists a dual optimal solution $(\bar{\eta}^*, \bar{\lambda}^*)$. By lemma 1 $\bar{\eta}^*$ has non-zero coordinates corresponding only to support planes passing through the optimum (u^*, z_*), i.e., those gradient tangent planes at this point, one for each function $f^{(j)}$. This also applies to $\bar{\lambda}^*$ and constraint functions $g^{(i)}$, and therefore we may write

$\bar{\eta}^* = (\bar{\eta}_*^{(1)}, \ldots, \bar{\eta}_*^{(N)})$ and $\lambda^* = (\bar{\lambda}_*^{(1)}, \ldots, \bar{\lambda}_*^{(m)})$. Thus, upon setting $\eta_*^{(j)} = \mu_*^{(j)}\bar{\eta}_*^{(j)}$ for $j = 1, \ldots N$ and $\lambda_*^{(i)} = v_*^{(i)}\,\bar{\lambda}_*^{(i)}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m$, we obtain the following dual optimal conditions:

$$(1) \qquad -\sum_j \partial f_*^{(j)}\ \eta_*^{(j)} + \sum_i \partial g_*^{(i)}\ \lambda_*^{(i)} = 0$$

$$\text{and}\ (2) \qquad \sum_j \eta_*^{(j)} = 1.$$

where all $\eta_*^{(j)}$ and $\lambda_*^{(i)} \geq 0$.

The equality of dual functionals yields,

$$f(u^*) = z_* = \sum_j f^{(j)}(u^*)\ \eta_*^{(j)} - \sum_j u^{*T}\partial f_*^{(j)}\ \eta_*^{(j)} + \sum_i u^{*T}\ \partial g_*^{(i)}\ \lambda_*^{(i)} + \sum_i (-g^{(i)}(u^*)\ \lambda_*^{(i)}$$

$$= \sum_j f^{(j)}(u^*)\ \eta_*^{(j)} - \sum_i g^{(i)}(u^*)\ \lambda_*^{(i)}\ .$$

Since $f^{(j)}(u^*) \leq f(u^*)$ for all j and $g^{(i)}(u^*) \geq 0$ for all i, it therefore follows that, (3) $\Sigma g^{(i)}(u^*)\ \lambda_*^{(i)} = 0$. Furthermore, since $f(u^*) = \max\ \{f^{(j)}(u^*)\}$, it follows that $\eta_*^{(j)} = 0$ whenever $f^{(j)}(u^*) < f(u^*)$, giving condition (2). Thus, the three conditions of the theorem are proved.

On the other hand, given positive vectors η^* and λ^* satisfying conditions (1), (2), and (3) with respect to u^*, then since $\mu_*^{(j)} \neq 0$ and $\lambda_*^{(j)} \neq 0$ in the canonically closed system $(\bar{I})$, we obtain dual feasible solutions upon setting $\bar{\eta}_*^{(j)} = \eta_*^{(j)}/\mu_*^{(j)}$ and $\bar{\lambda}_*^{(i)} = \lambda_*^{(i)}/v_i^*$. Furthermore, the dual objective value is $\Sigma\ f^{(j)}(u^*)\ \eta_*^{(j)}$, and condition (2) implies that $f(u^*) = \Sigma\ f^{(j)}(u^*)\eta_*^{(j)}$ giving dual equality of objective functions, thereby proving that $(f(u^*), u^*)$ is optimal.

Our generalization of the quasi-saddle point version of the Kuhn-Tucker Theorem is not as general as we may possibly get, but it does indicate a unified approach to study these equivalences under more general circumstances. In fact, we are already obtaining results for generalized saddle-point equivalence theorems for arbitrary convex functions over R_n. This is the subject of another paper and will be reported on elsewhere.

Already these methods have shown that the crucial property of the constraint functions is the Farkas-Minkowski property, which is a property of the functions themselves expressed in terms of finite positive linear combinations of their "gradients." Geometric qualifications are sufficient restrictions on the constraining functions to permit such Farkas-Minkowski expressions. In general, however, it may be necessary to go beyond the natural gradient inequalities provided by the constraint functions to obtain strong duality results.

In conclusion, we illustrate this now by constructing a canonically closed equivalent for the one-variable Slater example by adjoining a new variable to the gradient inequality system following the methods of our regularization procedures for semi-infinite programs. [1/]

Restating the Slater example, we have:

(I)

$$\min \quad x$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad -(1-x)^2 \geq 0 \qquad \text{with unique optimum}$$

$x_* = 1$. Introducing a differential system of supports to contain the optimum, we obtain the equivalent problem:

(I)

$$\min \quad x$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad 2(1-\alpha)\, x \geq 1-\alpha^2 \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leq \alpha \leq 2.$$

[1/] See Salter [7], [4] p 216, and [5], p 119

Let M and V be large positive numbers, either real or non-Archimedean, *i.e.* larger than any real number[1], and construct the following semi-infinite dual regularizations.

(I_R)

$$\begin{array}{rll} \min & Mt + x & \\ \text{subject to} & t + 2(1-\alpha)\, x \geq 1-\alpha^2, & 0 \leq \alpha \leq 2 \\ & x \geq -V & \\ & -x \geq -V & \end{array}$$

(II_R)

$$\begin{array}{rl} \max & \sum_\alpha (1-\alpha^2)\, \lambda_\alpha - V\lambda^+ - V\lambda^- \\ \text{subject to} & \sum_\alpha \lambda_\alpha = M \\ & \sum_\alpha 2(1-\alpha)\, \lambda_\alpha + \lambda^+ - \lambda^- = 1 \\ & \lambda\text{'s} \geq 0. \end{array}$$

Observe that problem (I_R) is canonically closed and that $t \geq 0$ is included in the inequality system and corresponds to the index point $\alpha = 1$. As stated above, M may be viewed as real or non-Archimedean, and therefore we shall derive dual optimal solutions for (I_R) and (II_R) in a manner which is valid for either case.

We know that $(t,x) = (0,1)$ is (I_R)-feasible with functional value 1. Thus, we search for a solution (t_*, x_*) with objective value < 1, if it exists, and therefore we assume $x_* < 1$. By lemma 1, this optimum involves only support planes which are tangent to it and therefore involves only its <u>own</u> gradient inequality with index point $\alpha_* = x_*$. But this implies $t_* = (1-\alpha_*)^2$ yielding (I_R)-objective value $M(1-\alpha_*)^2 + \alpha_*$. Applying the usual differential methods for finding a minimum to this function yields the Taylor expansion,

---

[1] See [3] pp 756-7

$$M(1 - \alpha_*)^2 + \alpha_* = \frac{4M - 1}{4M} + M\left(\alpha_* - \frac{2M - 1}{2M}\right)^2 \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leq \alpha_* \leq 2,$$

an equation which is obviously valid for arbitrary M. This tells us to take $\alpha_* = \frac{2M - 1}{2M}$ to obtain minimum objective value $\frac{4M - 1}{4M} < 1$. Furthermore, the point $(t_*, x_*) = (\frac{1}{4M^2}, \frac{2M - 1}{2M})$ is (I_R)-feasible because $t \geq \frac{1}{4M^2} -(\alpha - \frac{2M - 1}{2M})^2 = 1 - \alpha^2 - 2(1-\alpha)x_*$ for $0 \leq \alpha \leq 2$, which is a restatement of (I_R)-feasibility. But taking $\lambda_{\alpha_*} = M$, the dual variable associated with the binding constraint, and $\lambda_\alpha = 0$ for $\alpha \neq \alpha_*$ and $\lambda^+ = \lambda^- = 0$, yields a dual (II_R)-solution with equality of dual objective functions, and therefore shows that in fact the two solutions form dual optimal solutions for problems (I_R) -(II_R) whether M is viewed as real or non-Archimedean.

Observe that the dual solution, λ^*, is an extreme point of the associated generalized finite sequence space 1/ and as such the non-zero coordinate is linear and homogeneous in M 2/, in particular, $\lambda_{\alpha_*} = M$. Two courses of action with respect to M are now open to us. <u>First</u>, if M is real, we may let $M \to \infty$ so that $(t_*, x_*) \to (0,1)$, the solution to the Slater problem, with corresponding dual variable characterized by $\lambda_{\alpha_*} \to \infty$. <u>Second</u>, viewing M as non-Archimedean, we obtain dual optimal solutions in Hilbert's field with common objective value $1 - {}^1/_{4M}$ which in the extended ordering is <u>larger</u> than any real number less than 1, but itself is less than 1.

1/ See [4] p 211

2/ See [2], where this statement was first proved for finite linear programming over non-Archimedean ordered fields.

References

1. Arrow, K. J., L. Hurwicz and Uzawa, H., "Constraint Qualifications in Maximization Problems," Naval Research Logistics Quarterly, Vol. 8, No. 2, June 1961.

2. Charnes, A., and W. W. Cooper, "The Strong Minkowski Farkas-Weyl Theorem for Vector spaces over Ordered Fields," Proceedings of Nat. Acad. Sciences, Vol. 44, No. 9, pp 914-916, Sept. 1958

3. ____________ and ____________ , Management Models and Industrial Applications of Linear Programming, Vols. I and II, New York, J. Wiley and Sons, 1961.

4. Charnes, A., Cooper, W. W. and Kortanek, K., "Duality in Semi-Infinite Programs and Some works of Haar and Caratheodory," Management Science, Vol. 9, No. 2, January, 1963, 209-228.

5. ____________, ________, and ____________, "On Representations of Semi-Infinite Programs Which Have No Duality Gaps," Management Science, Vol. 12, No. 1, September, 1965.

6. Kortanek, K., "Duality, Semi-Infinite Programming, and Some Aspects of Control in Business and Economic Systems," Ph.D. Thesis, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., 1964.

7. Kuhn, H. W., and Tucker, A. W., "Non-Linear Programming," Proc. 2nd Berkeley Symp. Math. Stat. and Prob., J. Neyman (ed.), U. Calif. Press, Berkeley, Calif., 1951, pp. 481-492.

8. Slater, M. "Lagrange Multipliers Revisited: A Contribution to Non-Linear Programming," Cowles Commission Paper, Math. No. 403, New Haven, Nov. 1950.

Unclassified
Security Classification

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA - R&D

(Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall report is classified)

1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate author) Northwestern University	2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified
	2b. GROUP Not applicable

3. REPORT TITLE

Semi-infinite Programming, Differentiability, and Geometric Programming II

4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates)

5. AUTHOR(S) (Last name, first name, initial)

Charnes, Abraham; Cooper, William W.; Kortanek, Kenneth O.

6. REPORT DATE	7a. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES	7b. NO. OF REFS
April, 1966	11	8

8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO. Nonr-1228(10); Nonr-760(24)* DA-31-124-ARO-D-322- Northwestern	9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) Systems Research Memo. 150 Management Sciences Research Report No. 74
b. PROJECT NO. NR 047-021, NR 047-048*	
c. *Carnegie Tech	9b. OTHER REPORT NO(S) (Any other numbers that may be assigned this report) Cornell University, Dept. of Industrial Engg.; NIH, 1 P10 ES 00098-01

10. AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES

Releasable without limitations on dissemination

11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY
	Logistics and Mathematical Statistics Branch Office of Naval Research Washington, D. C. 20360

13. ABSTRACT

The CCK duality theory of semi-infinite programming is specialized to situations involving differentiability (or partial differentiability) of objective and constraint functions to obtain in a uniform and direct manner various results and interpretations, such as generalization of the Kuhn-Tucker Theorem, the "geometric" programming of Duffin-Peterson, and the Slater constraint qualification example.

DD FORM 1 JAN 64 1473

Unclassified
Security Classification

Unclassified
Security Classification

14. KEY WORDS	LINK A ROLE	LINK A WT	LINK B ROLE	LINK B WT	LINK C ROLE	LINK C WT
semi-infinite programming, differentiability, and Kuhn Tucker Theorem geometric programming Slater constraint qualification and Non-Archimedean dual regularizations						

INSTRUCTIONS

1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY: Enter the name and address of the contractor, subcontractor, grantee, Department of Defense activity or other organization (*corporate author*) issuing the report.

2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION: Enter the overall security classification of the report. Indicate whether "Restricted Data" is included. Marking is to be in accordance with appropriate security regulations.

2b. GROUP: Automatic downgrading is specified in DoD Directive 5200.10 and Armed Forces Industrial Manual. Enter the group number. Also, when applicable, show that optional markings have been used for Group 3 and Group 4 as authorized.

3. REPORT TITLE: Enter the complete report title in all capital letters. Titles in all cases should be unclassified. If a meaningful title cannot be selected without classification, show title classification in all capitals in parenthesis immediately following the title.

4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES: If appropriate, enter the type of report, e.g., interim, progress, summary, annual, or final. Give the inclusive dates when a specific reporting period is covered.

5. AUTHOR(S): Enter the name(s) of author(s) as shown on or in the report. Enter last name, first name, middle initial. If military, show rank and branch of service. The name of the principal author is an absolute minimum requirement.

6. REPORT DATE: Enter the date of the report as day, month, year; or month, year. If more than one date appears on the report, use date of publication.

7a. TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES: The total page count should follow normal pagination procedures, i.e., enter the number of pages containing information.

7b. NUMBER OF REFERENCES: Enter the total number of references cited in the report.

8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER: If appropriate, enter the applicable number of the contract or grant under which the report was written.

8b, 8c, & 8d. PROJECT NUMBER: Enter the appropriate military department identification, such as project number, subproject number, system numbers, task number, etc.

9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S): Enter the official report number by which the document will be identified and controlled by the originating activity. This number must be unique to this report.

9b. OTHER REPORT NUMBER(S): If the report has been assigned any other report numbers (*either by the originator or by the sponsor*), also enter this number(s).

10. AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES: Enter any limitations on further dissemination of the report, other than those imposed by security classification, using standard statements such as:

(1) "Qualified requesters may obtain copies of this report from DDC."

(2) "Foreign announcement and dissemination of this report by DDC is not authorized."

(3) "U. S. Government agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from DDC. Other qualified DDC users shall request through
_______________________________________."

(4) "U. S. military agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from DDC. Other qualified users shall request through
_______________________________________."

(5) "All distribution of this report is controlled. Qualified DDC users shall request through
_______________________________________."

If the report has been furnished to the Office of Technical Services, Department of Commerce, for sale to the public, indicate this fact and enter the price, if known.

11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES: Use for additional explanatory notes.

12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY: Enter the name of the departmental project office or laboratory sponsoring (*paying for*) the research and development. Include address.

13. ABSTRACT: Enter an abstract giving a brief and factual summary of the document indicative of the report, even though it may also appear elsewhere in the body of the technical report. If additional space is required, a continuation sheet shall be attached.

It is highly desirable that the abstract of classified reports be unclassified. Each paragraph of the abstract shall end with an indication of the military security classification of the information in the paragraph, represented as *(TS), (S), (C), or (U)*.

There is no limitation on the length of the abstract. However, the suggested length is from 150 to 225 words.

14. KEY WORDS: Key words are technically meaningful terms or short phrases that characterize a report and may be used as index entries for cataloging the report. Key words must be selected so that no security classification is required. Identifiers, such as equipment model designation, trade name, military project code name, geographic location, may be used as key words but will be followed by an indication of technical context. The assignment of links, rules, and weights is optional.